

17. We fully agree with the statement of the Secretary-General that:

"The emergence in recent years of scores of territories from colonial rule to independence and the clear prospect that the remaining colonial areas will shortly take their rightful places among the family of nations lend urgency to demands upon the international community to provide them with material and technical assistance, if these new nations are to achieve the monumental tasks of making their newly won independence meaningful through as rapid development of their economic and social potential as possible." [A/5201/Add.1, p. 3.]

In giving our full support to this, I find it necessary to stress once again that, in emphasizing the responsibilities of the United Nations in assisting these areas, the assistance required by the conditions prevailing in other less developed areas of the world should not be ignored.

18. Great changes in the political structure of our society have taken place with great speed. We are witnessing the political emancipation of one country after another, but the changes in the structure of the world economy are slow. The primary producing countries are suffering without any protection and they are not able to diversify their national economies in order to raise their standards of living by industrialization. Industrialization is impossible to achieve without the help and assistance of international organizations and the industrially advanced countries. The facts show that the developed countries are progressing with greater speed toward a brighter horizon, while the less developed countries, although struggling very hard, are still suffering from poverty, ill health, undernourishment and lack of education. More help and assistance under bilateral and multilateral arrangements is necessary to help the developing countries in their attempts to reach higher standards of living.

19. I want to emphasize that the launching of the United Nations Development Decade is an important step which has been taken by this Organization. The Decade calls for the mobilization of all the resources of the Organization, of the specialized agencies, and of the technical co-operative organs.

20. We support the recommendations made in this respect by the Secretary-General, particularly those recommendations which call for expansion in the flow of capital and assistance to under-developed countries; an increase of \$25 million yearly in the resources of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund in order to reach a combined level of \$300 million annually for these valuable activities; intensification of work to develop natural resources, and, in particular, action to stabilize the international commodity markets on which the economies of developing countries depend. We hope also that the proposals concerning the creation of a United Nations Capital Development Fund will be approved as soon as possible without further delay.

21. I have one last word, on the importance of international co-operation in world trade. We have important items related to this question on our agenda. Because of its importance, the United Nations has been dealing with this question since its foundation. World trade is an important instrument of co-operation among nations. This co-operation will be strengthened if discriminatory economic and trade policies are not

pursued by one or a group of nations against other nations. We, on our part, recognize the importance of international trade, and we have maintained our trade relations in an atmosphere of friendly co-operation with all countries.

22. To promote better trade, coastal States should co-operate with countries which are without a seacoast, and should not hinder their economic progress by the imposition of obstructions in the way of their trade relations with other countries. In this respect, all Member nations should respect General Assembly resolution 1028 (XI) which decided that the need of land-locked States, and States having no access to the sea, for adequate transit facilities, should be recognized in promoting international trade. This resolution further invites all Members of the United Nations to give:

"... full recognition to the needs of land-locked Member States in the matter of transit trade, and, therefore, to accord them adequate facilities in terms of international law and practice in this regard ..."

We hope that the terms of this resolution, which was adopted unanimously by the Assembly, will be respected by all Members, because now almost one-sixth of the Members of the United Nations are land-locked, and, to promote world trade, this co-operation is indeed important and necessary.

23. Mr. President, before I leave the rostrum, I should like to address to you a final word, and join the previous speakers in expressing to you my congratulations on your election as President of this session.

24. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to congratulate you on behalf of the Soviet delegation on your election to this high post.

25. The Soviet Government's attitude towards the crucial international problems of our times has been expounded from this rostrum on more than one occasion. Twice, in 1959 and 1960, the General Assembly Hall has been the scene of statements by Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, the Head of the Soviet Government [799th and 569th meetings], in which the foreign policy of the Soviet Union was set forth in detail. These statements proclaimed throughout the world the optimistic outlook of the Soviet people, and its conviction that a new world war was not fatally inevitable and that the present generation of mankind was capable of averting such a war and preventing it from breaking out.

26. To ensure the peaceful coexistence of States with different social structures and to create conditions which will make it possible completely to exclude war from the life of society—such is the basic task, in the field of international relations, set by the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which was adopted last October by that Party's Twenty-second Congress. The foreign policy of the Soviet State is determined by that objective.

27. For thousands of years, periods of peaceful life have been mere breathing-spaces between one war and the next. War simply left the stage for a time, just as servicemen go into the reserve after having completed their term of duty. But the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki forced people who had not yet been

able to recover from the horrors of the Second World War into familiarity with the spectre of a third one.

28. The invention of rocket-propelled nuclear weapons did not represent merely the addition of yet another type of weapon to those already in existence. It meant an incomparable, a colossal, leap forward in the development of means of destruction and annihilation. It presented, in all its magnitude, the task of saving mankind from a destructive world war. And this task the peoples are now in a position to undertake.

29. A comparison of the political map of the world on the eve of the Second World War with a similar map of the present-day world clearly reveals the radical evolution which has altered the aspect of our planet during that period.

30. The map of 1938 did not show the mighty confraternity of the socialist countries, now embracing more than one third of the world's population and more than one quarter of its territory. Socialism by its very nature aspires to peace, just as aggression and military adventure are foreign to it. For this reason the socialist countries throw the whole of their international authority and might into the scales of the struggle for peace.

31. As the result of national-liberation wars and anti-imperialist revolutions over fifty sovereign States have arisen on the ruins of colonial empires, most of them having attained their independence during the past six years. And these States are swelling the ranks of those who defend the cause of peace.

32. Look at the map of Central Europe. It no longer displays Hitler's Reich, which unleashed the Second World War. The backbone of German militarism, as a result of that war, was broken. A peace-loving German State, the German Democratic Republic, has established itself east of the Elbe. This, too, will promote the maintenance of peace.

33. But no geographical atlas can reflect yet another very important factor which has changed the situation in the world—the peoples' growing determination to manacle the forces planning war. If we were to choose any specific colour for indicating the places where people concerned to prevent war live and labour, we should probably have to shade, with that colour, every inhabited tract of land. However, in that uniformly coloured map we should have to stick flags of a different colour, showing the location of those who are impelling mankind towards a new war.

34. But the existence of the possibility of averting war is one thing, and the realization of that possibility another. The General Assembly of the United Nations cannot fail to be aware that with every passing day preparations for a rocket-nuclear war are expanding throughout the world and that the threat of the outbreak of such a war is consequently increasing.

35. The United Nations would not justify the hopes of the peoples if it were to repeat the lamentable experience and mistakes of its predecessor, the League of Nations, which, like the United Nations, was intended to combat aggression and the arms race and to strive for the strengthening of peace and the security of States. It is common knowledge that the League of Nations disintegrated, like a metal structure eaten away by rust, because it was undermined and shattered by aggressive forces. Those forces prevented the adoption of proposals for disarmament, and for the suppressing of aggression and international provocation, sub-

mitted by the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries; in other words, they did not allow the League of Nations to become a real instrument for the defence of peace. Moreover the fascist States, seeking to create conditions of impunity for themselves and to have their hands free for aggression, left the League of Nations altogether. As we know, Japan was the first to go, after having attacked China, and was followed by Hitlerite Germany and finally by fascist Italy.

36. At that time, the Soviet Union issued forceful warnings and called for effective measures to prevent aggression and to avert the outbreak of a world war, but the League of Nations disregarded those proposals and did nothing to prevent the catastrophe.

37. After the Second World War, the United Nations was created, with the object of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war. An analysis of the position which has now developed suggests a certain analogy with the period of sore trial for the League of Nations which preceded its disintegration. The present situation in the United Nations cannot but alarm all those who stand for the maintenance of peace and peaceful coexistence.

38. A circumstance bound to arouse particular concern among the Members of the United Nations gathered here for the General Assembly's seventeenth session is the statement on Cuba made by Mr. Kennedy, the President of the United States of America, at a press conference held on 13 September last. The United States of America is one of the founders of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council: economically and militarily it is the most powerful of all the capitalist countries. It would seem that such a country and its statesmen, if only because of the responsibility weighing upon the United States of America as a great Power, should show particular respect for the United Nations Charter and frame their policy accordingly. But this statement by President Kennedy indicates precisely the contrary.

39. The Soviet Government has naturally observed that the statement of the President of the United States also contained some sound appraisals, revealing a realistic understanding of certain aspects of the Cuban question and of the situation which has developed. It must be noted that the Government of the United States of America has publicly dissociated itself from the bellicose circles in its country which have been calling for immediate armed aggression against Cuba. But the tone is set, not by these sober pronouncements, but by crude threats—which in fact cancels out what was positive in the statement. It follows from the President's words that the United States of America is free to take military action against Cuba and will decide for itself the juncture at which it regards it as necessary to undertake such an invasion. The President said that the United States Government would continue as before to collaborate with the leaders of the Cuban counter-revolution, who have found refuge in the territory of the United States. The events of recent days do not reduce, but intensify the alarm felt by States Members of the United Nations with regard to United States policy towards Cuba.

40. We may ask: Where are the obligations, solemnly assumed by the United States of America under the United Nations Charter, which provide for non-intervention by States in each other's domestic affairs? Are we to believe that when the United States delegation, which sat at the same table with us at the Conference of States founders of the United Nations in

1945, affixed its signature to the Charter in the name of the United States of America, that was nothing but an empty farce? In those days, after all, the leaders of the United States Government assured us that the United States of America took seriously the obligations it was assuming under the United Nations Charter. But where is this serious attitude now?

41. Representatives gathered here for the General Assembly have doubtless already been able to realize the extent to which war hysteria in regard to Cuba has arisen in the United States, and what a campaign of hostility against the Cuban people is rampant in American newspapers, radio and television. Things have reached such a point that a list of pretexts which could be used to justify an invasion of Cuba has been published in advance, and this list includes everything under the sun.

42. For example, if the United States of America considers that Cuba is in any way "hampering" the functioning of the experimental rocket-launching pads at Cape Canaveral in Florida, that would apparently suffice for the mightiest Power of the Western hemisphere to bear down upon little Cuba with all its military strength. Of course, those who contemplate aggression against Cuba will find no difficulty in levelling any charges they wish against that country, however absurd the charges may be. In the final analysis, Cuba can be blamed for any failure of rocket tests on Cape Canaveral. Apparently, Cuba is already at fault for being situated so near to Florida.

43. If this logic is taken as a guide, it would appear that any State, especially a powerful one, can accuse its neighbour of hampering the execution of certain measures in a given area. But since it is impossible to remove even a small State in the way that houses, for instance, are nowadays moved from one place to another, and since Cuba cannot be moved farther away from Florida or Florida from Cuba, what is the solution? Does this mean that the stronger neighbour has the right to gobble up the weaker?

44. Another of the listed pretexts for attacking Cuba is the existence of a threat to the security of the United States military base at Guantánamo, which is maintained on the territory of Cuba without the consent of its Government. But is it not clear that any incident can be invented in the United States of America and declared to be evidence of a threat to that base?

45. It is also said that the United States of America will be prepared to attack Cuba if it considers that Cuba is building up its forces to such a degree that it may constitute a threat to the United States of America, a threat to United States communications with the Panama Canal, or a threat to any State of the Western hemisphere. Any clear-thinking person knows that Cuba is pursuing neither the first, nor the second nor the third of these objectives. The statesmen of the United States of America also know this full well. They are further quite aware of the fact that the assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to Cuba for the strengthening of its independence has none of those objectives in view, since they are foreign to our policy.

46. A number of other equally trumped-up charges against Cuba could be adduced, each and all amounting to one and the same thing: that the United States of America announces the circumstances in which it may commit an act of aggression against Cuba, and that the United States itself assumes the role of judge in determining whether or not such circumstances have arisen.

47. It may be asked: What sort of a policy is this? It is a policy of aggression, a policy of international banditry. Upon what is such a policy based? Obviously, upon a notion inherited from barbaric times: you are strong, then throttle the less strong and especially the weak. But such are the laws of the wild animal kingdom, where the strong devour the weak. These, however, are beasts. Human beings must surely distinguish themselves from the beasts.

48. Some statesmen of the United States speak of the need to tighten control over the whole Caribbean area, as if the Caribbean Sea were some kind of internal lake within the United States of America. Let us merely ask: Who agrees to recognize United States control over the international waters of that sea? The United States might with equal success claim the Atlantic Ocean as its own, as the self-appointed heir of the god Neptune, who in ancient mythology was the lord of the seas. The less-bridled politicians in the United States, clearly losing control of their reasoning, say, if you please, that it is necessary to control the movements of Soviet ships carrying goods to Cuba and from Cuba to the Soviet Union, and of the specialists who are helping the Cubans to put their industry and agriculture on an even keel. But who is going to permit the exercise of such control? Is it not clear that such demands are a call to piracy and must be decisively condemned? It would be better if those making such demands understood their reckless nature.

49. And what can be said about the crude pressure exerted by the United States upon a number of other States, including its own allies in NATO, with a view to preventing them from supplying ships for the transport of goods to and from Cuba? What value attaches to the statements of United States representatives when, under the roof of the United Nations, they speak of economic co-operation and assistance to other countries while at the same time this mighty Power tries to snatch a crust of bread from the hands of a small country?

50. Can the United Nations tolerate the fact that one of its Members loudly proclaims its right to attack another country which is also a Member of the United Nations? And that it does so because the domestic institutions of that other country conflict with the way of thinking of the United States Government and are not to its taste?

51. No, it is not possible to disregard such statements. This is indeed to undermine the one foundation upon which the United Nations can rest: non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States, and respect for their institutions and way of life. It would seem that the countries belonging to the capitalistic system consider it possible, in order to ensure the dominance of that system throughout the world, to attack a State having a different, a socialist, social system. But such a policy would be the death-sentence for the United Nations, since the Organization can exist only if all countries, regardless of their social or political structures, respect each other's independence and sovereignty and do not permit interference by one in the affairs of another. If the United Nations were to concur in the principles proclaimed by the President of the United States of America in his statement on Cuba, that would lead straight to its collapse. This is a policy capable of destroying the United Nations. And the United Nations will in fact be destroyed if that policy prevails.

52. The situation is becoming all the more dangerous in that the United States is not only using with independent and peace-loving Cuba the language of menace, but is also engaging in concrete acts of aggression against that State.

53. It is a matter of common knowledge that many cut-throats driven out by the Cuban people have found shelter in the United States or live on American money, in neighbouring countries, whence they carry out piratical raids on the Republic of Cuba. These raids are executed with the support of the United States, which provides Cuba's inveterate enemies with all the arms and equipment they need. Full responsibility for the piratical activities and banditry of the Cuban cut-throats rests, therefore, with the Government of the United States.

54. If one State Member of the United Nations arrogates to itself the right to announce and conduct a policy threatening the independence and security of its neighbours, then other States Members will obviously be unable to rely on the United Nations and will be compelled to seek other means of repelling the insolent imperialistic encroachments of those who wish to rule the world by force of arms. It will then only remain for the United Nations, as for the League of Nations in its day, to look on at its own collapse. But times are altogether different nowadays. They are far from what they were in the period of the League of Nations, and are not even what they were in the first years after the Second World War. In our day of the conquest of space, States possess rocket-nuclear weapons, with all their appalling destructive power. Today only a madman could conduct a policy from "positions of strength", or even think that such a policy might in any way be successful and enable him to impose his ideology or his own form of political organization upon other States. The Soviet Union and the socialist countries possess, at the very least, the same implements as the capitalist countries. For that reason, questions in dispute must now be settled, not by rattling the sabre and threatening other States, but by seeking reasonable arguments and arriving at decisions such as to strengthen peace and security for all peoples.

55. Respect for the sovereign rights of every State, renunciation of all intervention in the domestic affairs of other States, recognition of the right of Governments to establish the social and political system corresponding to the interests and wishes of their people—such must be the fixed and infrangible rules of contemporary international life. Without the unswerving observance of these rules there can be neither peace, nor peaceful coexistence, nor, in the final analysis, even a United Nations.

56. That is why the Soviet Government considers it necessary to raise its voice in warning and draw the attention of States Members of the United Nations to the full seriousness of the implications, for peace, of the policy pursued by the United States of America in regard to the Republic of Cuba. If the States represented here wish to preserve the United Nations and to make it an effective instrument for the preservation and strengthening of peace, then such a policy and such actions must be resolutely condemned.

57. In our time—and this applies particularly to a great Power—we cannot lose our heads or our composure and treat questions involving war and peace as lightly as some United States political leaders treat the situation in regard to Cuba. An attack on Cuba would lead to the consequences of which the Soviet

Government warned the whole world in its well-known declaration of 11 September 1962.

58. Those who have formed aggressive military groupings and thrown a network of their own military bases—those spring-boards of aggression—around the world, those who are preventing the elimination of the traces of the Second World War, can hardly be expected to come to this rostrum and say "Yes, we are initiating and taking part in preparations for war". It is a well-known fact that wars are almost always prepared behind a screen of assurances about devotion to peace. That is the bitter truth. And the alarm must be sounded, not after the fatal events, but today.

59. Study the newspapers and magazines and listen carefully to the voices on the radio of a number of countries, and you will come to the inescapable conclusion that those circles which have diverted one of science's greatest achievements—the liberation of atomic power—to purposes of destruction and annihilation are working day and night to becloud the minds of the peoples and accustom them to the thought that nuclear war is inevitable.

60. Policy-making officials in the United States, the United Kingdom and other Western countries can often be heard saying that the best guarantee against a new war is the "balance of fear". Means of destruction and annihilation have become so powerful, argue the proponents of this view, that no State will run the risk of starting a nuclear war since it will inevitably sustain a retaliatory nuclear blow. And since each side realizes this, the fear of retribution should restrain it from beginning to resort to the language of arms. And therefore, we are told, the higher the mountains of arms that are piled up, and the more destructive and murderous those arms become, the better it will be, because the greater will be the fear.

61. In other words, in the view of the advocates of this dangerous and aggressive doctrine, which in some NATO countries has been elevated to the status of a Government policy, the supreme expression of a love of peace is general and complete ... armament, a frenzied orgy of arming.

62. But to base the policy of States on a feeling of universal fear would be tantamount to keeping the world in a permanent state of feverish tension and eve-of-war hysteria. In such an atmosphere, each State would fear that the other side would lose its nerve and fire the first shot. Would not this create the temptation to prevent the opponent from gaining a lead? This would be exactly like a duel of olden times when the opponents raised their pistols, aimed at each other's foreheads, and waited for the other's shot—with perhaps this difference, that there would be no seconds to see that the rules of the duel were observed and to give the signal for it to begin.

63. The military doctrine of the "balance of fear" is simply half a step towards the even more dangerous doctrine of a preventive nuclear war. But the Soviet delegation will discuss this point separately.

64. There is only one reliable way of preventing a new world war from breaking out, and that is to destroy the material apparatus of war. General and complete disarmament—such is the programme of action which is now being advocated by no less than three quarters of the world's countries. This programme will be carried out sooner if fewer people are victims of the notion that the arms race and war are inevitable, and if they fight with more resolution

and solidarity for disarmament as an urgent and performable task.

65. The United Nations has been discussing the problem of disarmament for over sixteen years. It might be said that this problem has become a United Nations "sputnik". A large number of commissions, committees and sub-committees have already been put into orbit around this problem. Unfortunately they too have experienced a state akin to weightlessness, for, translated into realistic terms, the decisions they have taken in fact weigh nothing at all. Even now the Eighteen-Nation Committee, charged with drafting an agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control, has been unable to gratify the General Assembly with any successful fulfilment of the task assigned to it.

66. What is the matter? Why is the negotiating machinery merely "ticking over"? The reason is that by no means all the participants in the negotiations are really trying to reach agreement on disarmament.

67. The Soviet Government submitted to the Committee a comprehensive draft treaty on general and complete disarmament [DC/203, annex 1, sec. C]. This draft provided that general and complete disarmament would be brought about in three stages over a period of four years. Even after completion of the first stage, the world would be radically different from the world in which we live today, in that there would no longer be any danger of a nuclear attack by one State upon another. For under the Soviet draft, the first stage would see the destruction of all vehicles for delivering nuclear weapons to their targets, the liquidation of military bases on foreign territory, and the withdrawal of foreign troops to within their national frontiers. This means that nuclear weapons would already be rendered harmless and would lie like worthless stuff, in depots. As a result of the measures to be taken during the second stage, nuclear weapons would be destroyed and the very conception of "nuclear Power" would disappear. By the end of the third stage, the abolition of all armed forces and armaments would be complete. [DC/203, annex 1, section C.]

68. If the proposals of the Soviet Government were implemented, then by the time the children born in the year of the disarmament treaty's conclusion were old enough to go to school there would no longer remain in the world any armaments which might some day threaten their lives.

69. During the work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, the Soviet Government made a number of important additions and amendments [A/5200-DC/205, annex 1, sect. D] to its draft treaty, in order to make it easier to find a common language in discussions with the Western Powers. It accepted the ideas of the Western Powers regarding the reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments, and met the Western Powers half-way in regard to the levels of armed forces, although it considered that a more radical reduction in armaments and the numbers of men under arms would be more in the interest of the quickest possible accomplishment of disarmament.

70. The Governments of the Western Powers complained that the time-limits for disarmament envisaged in the Soviet draft were too rigid. The Soviet Government favours the swiftest possible implementation of a programme of general and complete disarmament:

but on this point, too, we did not insist on our conditions, and agreed that the time-limits for disarmament be spread over five years.

71. If the business of disarmament has so far failed to make any headway, as though it were frozen deep in centuries-old ice, the blame for this must be placed on the NATO Powers and on them alone. The proposals which the Western Powers brought with them to Geneva were stuffed with all sorts of things, but the main thing was lacking—the readiness to scrap the war machine of States. These proposals are based, as before, on the desire to establish control over armaments, and not over disarmament: to breach the defence system of the USSR and the other socialist countries; and to maintain, for an indefinite length of time, the military bases and armed forces of the Western Powers on foreign soil.

72. It is a fact that the Governments of the Western Powers, and particularly the Government of the United States of America, stop short of no tricks and no juggling in order to justify the need for retaining their military bases on the territory of foreign States, virtually up to the very end of the disarmament programme's implementation. This means that they make disarmament itself impossible, since it would be naïve to think that the Soviet Union and the other socialist States would agree to accept so absurd a demand. Acceptance of this demand would mean that the Soviet Union and other peace-loving States would, in effect, be obliged to throw themselves on the mercy of the imperialist Powers and place their security in the hands of those Powers. We have no doubt that the demand to retain military bases on the territory of other countries has been specially devised to bury disarmament before any steps are taken to make it a reality.

73. The fact that the Western Powers are now putting their demands on control in a new form in no way changes the substance of these demands. They now propose that we should turn the territories of other States into something resembling a chess-board, divided into zones, and on this board play out the game of control. But the moves in this game would be made with the old aim in view—the securing of reconnaissance data which could be of interest only to a potential aggressor.

74. The Head of the Soviet Government, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, stated in 1960 from this rostrum [882nd meeting] that the Soviet Union was ready to accept any proposals of the Western Powers on control if the Western Powers, for their part, would accept the Soviet proposals on general and complete disarmament. For two years now we have been waiting for a reply.

75. At the Geneva talks, the United States Government objected categorically to the elimination, in the first stage of disarmament, of all vehicles for delivering nuclear weapons to their target, declaring that States embarking on disarmament would still for a time need some kind of "protective umbrella". We do not consider such conclusions to be justified; but in order to start a real move forward, we are ready to make yet another effort.

76. Taking into account the position of the Western Powers, the Soviet Government agrees that in the destruction, during the first stage of disarmament, of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles an exception should be made for a strictly limited and agreed number of global (intercontinental) missiles, anti-missile mis-

siles and anti-aircraft missiles of the "ground-air" type, to remain at the disposal of the Soviet Union and the United States, respectively, alone. Means of defence would thus be retained, for a fixed length of time, to guard against the eventuality, as to which Western leaders have expressed anxiety, of someone deciding to violate the treaty and conceal missiles or combat aircraft.

77. The Soviet Government is making corresponding amendments to its draft "Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict international control" which it is submitting for the consideration of the General Assembly of the United Nations at its present session.^{1/}

78. There is no wider international forum for the discussion of the disarmament problem than the United Nations General Assembly, in which over 100 States are represented. And this is the place where the truth should be made known about those who are stifling the hope for disarmament, who are placing their narrow, selfish aims above the vital interests of the peoples.

79. It is the monopolies which have made the production of instruments of death their trade that are the chief enemies of disarmament. They have reaped a bloody but rich harvest from the First and Second World Wars. Traders in death, they want to secure, both today and tomorrow, thousands of millions in profits. Tomorrow, as yesterday, they want no drying-up of the golden fountain of profit derived from the arms race, and therefore give the people no chance of escaping from the vicious circle—from war, through the creation of ever more destructive means of annihilation, to yet more destructive war. It is they who have fixed a hundred locks on the door between disarmament and the frenzied arms race. But in comparison with the consequences of a feverish arms race, in comparison with the thermo-nuclear war, the interests of a handful of people waxing fat on armaments are as nothing.

80. It is not armaments that are destined, in our age, to decide which social and political system is the best and to which the future belongs, but the demonstration, in peaceful competition, of the advantages of one system over the other. No matter what ideology they proclaim or what God they believe in, each and every nation wants to live. The cause of disarmament is therefore their common cause.

81. The Soviet Government calls on the Governments of Member States of the United Nations to take full cognizance of all their responsibility to the peoples in the matter of disarmament.

82. They are accustomed to looking at the problem of disarmament from only one angle—that of the elimination of the war machine of States. There is, however, another side to the matter. General and complete disarmament signifies not only destruction of the apparatus of war, but the freeing from the clutches of armaments of enormous material and financial resources.

83. The World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace which took place this summer at Moscow, and at which most nations and political trends of the present-day world were represented, stressed that the struggle for disarmament was also a struggle for a sound economic policy, which would enable disarmament

to be carried out in such a way as to serve, to the maximum, the progress of mankind.

84. Diverting the resources spent on armaments to the development of the peaceful economy of States, and to a raising of the living and cultural standards of the peoples, is a great and worthy task which merits the most serious consideration. The Soviet Government is therefore proposing the inclusion in the General Assembly's agenda, as a separate question, of the item "Economic programme for disarmament" [A/5233].

85. The experts who carried out an examination of the economic consequences of disarmament, in accordance with a decision taken by the General Assembly at its fifteenth session [resolution 1516 (XV)], established, on the basis of official data, that the world was spending roughly \$120,000 million annually on military account.^{2/} It followed that, if the arms race is not ended, at least \$3,000,000 million will be spent on military account in the next twenty-five years.

86. What would happen if these resources were directed to a productive end? It has been calculated that the available riches of the world could be more than doubled; and this is by no means all. It would be also possible to convert to peaceful needs the enormous sums at present immobilized in all kinds of armaments, ammunition and strategic reserves. One hundred million people who are uselessly employing their knowledge and strength in service in the armed forces or are working for war in industry, agriculture and transport could be successfully transferred to peaceful creative work. The removal of military inventions and techniques from the secret list would give a powerful stimulus to peaceful industry, and would transform the technology of civil branches of the economy.

87. Disarmament alone, of course, will not remedy all the troubles and adversities which at present afflict mankind; but it can materially expedite the development of all countries and, above all, help people to satisfy their most pressing needs.

88. Everyone gains from such a programme: the countries which owing to colonialism are economically backward, the socialist countries, and the industrialized capitalist countries.

89. According to the calculations of the economists, if one fifth of the money spent on military needs by the States belonging to military-political groups were used to promote the development of the economically backward countries, the sum for this purpose would amount to \$20,000 million a year, or \$500,000 million over twenty-five years. This sum together with their domestic resources, would suffice to enable the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to approach the current level of industrial output in countries such as England and France within the lifetime of the present generation, namely within the next twenty to twenty-five years. With \$500,000 million it would be possible to establish thirty to forty large new industrial areas in the world, similar to the Ruhr or to the industrial complex which has been set up in Soviet Siberia around the Bratsk hydroelectric power station.

90. The Soviet Government is submitting to the General Assembly a draft "Declaration concerning the

^{1/} Subsequently circulated as document A/C.1/867.

^{2/} Cf. Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament (E/3593/Rev.1) (United Nations publication, Sales No. 62.XV.1).

conversion to peaceful needs of the resources released by disarmament" [A/5233]. The Soviet Government considers that the United Nations should at once, without waiting for the conclusion of the negotiations on general and complete disarmament, proceed to the preparation of an international programme for the peaceful use of the means and resources at present employed for military purposes. The timely preparation of such a programme would not only make it possible to prepare on a world scale, for the painless transfer of States' economies to peaceful lines immediately after the reaching of agreement on disarmament; it would also help the peoples to appreciate more clearly the necessity and significance of disarmament, and would thus attract, under the banner of peaceful coexistence and disarmament, millions and millions of new and active supporters of this great cause.

91. The present session of the General Assembly is to have its say on the question of the suspension of nuclear tests.

92. The attitude of the Soviet Union is well known: it is that all nuclear tests—whether in the atmosphere, in the outer space, underground, or under water—should be banned immediately and unreservedly. If this matter had depended on the Soviet Union alone, experiments with nuclear weapons would long ago have ceased.

93. In order to justify their position, which obstructs the reaching of an agreement on the suspension of all types of nuclear weapon testing, the representatives of the Western Powers often resort to juggling with facts, seeking to reproach the Soviet Union with having allegedly broken some moratorium on nuclear explosions. To those who make such assertions, we must reply that it is impossible to break something which never existed.

94. Although the Soviet Union has more than once urged the Western Powers to negotiate a moratorium, no inter-State agreement involving commitment to a moratorium on nuclear explosions and to its observance has ever been reached. The myth about a moratorium was dragged out only when the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and other NATO States found themselves in need of an excuse for the new series of nuclear weapon tests unleashed by them.

95. Everyone knows quite well that it was not the Soviet Union which started nuclear testing and the nuclear arms race. All the nuclear test explosions set off by the Soviet Union have simply been an answer to the operations of the United States and its NATO allies, the United Kingdom and France. The United States was the first to embark on nuclear tests, so it is the United States and its allies which should be the first to suspend tests. The Soviet Union has every right to be the last to carry out nuclear weapon tests.

96. The Western Powers created the dispute over control, in order to kill any possibility of an international agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests. Science and experience confirm that States now possess all the necessary means for controlling, with adequate accuracy, the observance of an agreement on the suspension of tests. Even the specialists of the United States Department of Defense are now compelled to acknowledge this fact. Nevertheless, month after month and year after year, the United States and the United Kingdom have been preventing the conclusion

of such an agreement and have been seeking the Soviet Union's approval for the establishment on its territory of a network of international control posts which, while unnecessary for verification of the fulfilment of an agreement, are strongly desired by NATO's military staffs.

97. The United States and the United Kingdom oppose any proposals, whether advanced by the Soviet Union or by the neutralist States, for a ban on nuclear weapon tests, if such proposals are based on the possibility of using national detection systems for the purpose of control. In rejecting the proposals of the Soviet Union and the neutralist countries, the Western Powers continue to follow the old line: either the suspension of tests plus the establishment of a large-scale espionage system under the flag of control, or the legalization of underground nuclear explosions. It is to be hoped that they have not yet said their last word.

98. A few days ago the Soviet Government proposed the signature of an agreement banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space and specifically committing countries to continue negotiations on the suspension of underground tests. Naturally, while such negotiations are in progress and until such time as an agreement on the suspension of underground nuclear weapon tests is reached, such tests should not be conducted. We consider that this proposal provides a good basis for an agreement. The key to the solution of the problem lies in the hands of the Western Powers.

99. The General Assembly should also give serious consideration to the proposals on individual measures conducive to a lessening of international tension. There has long been a pressing need to implement the well-known proposal of the Polish People's Republic for the establishment of an atom-free zone in Central Europe [697th meeting].^{3/} The idea contained in this proposal gave rise to plans for the creation of "denuclearized" zones in a number of other areas of the world. By supporting these plans, the General Assembly would render a valuable service to the cause of peace.

100. Both an agreement by Governments to refrain from the use of nuclear weapons, and the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization, would constitute definite protection against the threat of nuclear war. These and other similar measures would at the same time remove not a few of the obstacles to general and complete disarmament.

101. In the present international situation, the task of normalizing international trade has assumed very great—I would even say, tremendous—importance. In this field there are abnormal circumstances which have been particularly aggravated by the establishment of the "Common Market".

102. The United Nations can see how entire groups of industrially developed countries, by means of discriminatory restrictions on trade, are locking the doors of their markets and adapting their external economic relations to the interests of the NATO military bloc.

103. Whatever the publicity attire in which the organizers of the "Common Market" may dress up their policy, they will convince no one that this closed economic group is not primarily directed towards intensifying the arms race and strengthening the West

^{3/} The "Rapacki Plan".

German revenge-seeking forces. It may also be counted upon to bind the economies of the under-developed States even closer to the economies of the imperialist Powers, to leave the new-born States with the one-sided economic structure inherited from colonialism, and to prevent these States from attaining to genuine independence.

104. It cannot be denied that the United Nations has a great debt to discharge towards the peoples, since the Organization itself is to a high degree called upon to concern itself with the improvement of international trade, which helps towards a more rational use of the labour of man and the natural wealth of the soil, and brings States closer together.

105. It has long been a pressing need to call an international conference on trade problems, which would consider the question of setting up an international trade organization embracing all areas and countries of the world without any sort of discrimination.

106. The Soviet Government is submitting to the General Assembly of the United Nations for its consideration, as a separate agenda item, a proposal for the holding in 1963 of an international conference on trade problems [A/5219]. It is convinced that such a conference, and the establishment of an international trade organization, would not only create a sound basis for the development of economic intercourse between States, but would also help to bring about an atmosphere of confidence in their relations and a lessening of international tension.

107. In using every means, including the development of mutually advantageous international trade relations, to help strengthen the economic self-dependence of the young independent States of Asia, Africa and Latin America, we must not forget that there are other countries and peoples which are still subject to the colonial yoke. I do not think I need list all the crimes perpetrated by the colonialists. Reports regarding these crimes are published and are known to Members of the General Assembly.

108. Everyone remembers the occasion when, acting on the appeal made by the Head of the Soviet Government, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)]. That marked a great step forward. Inspired by the lofty ideas expressed in the Declaration, many peoples have attained independence. The Algerian people's heroic struggle for liberation has culminated in resounding victory.

109. Many changes have taken place in the world in the two years which have elapsed since the adoption of that historic Declaration. Only the colonizers have not changed their nature: by every means in their power they have obstructed, and continue to obstruct, the peoples' liberation. To cherish the hope that they will amicably leave the oppressed peoples alone would involve protracting the Declaration's implementation indefinitely. Moreover, as the example of the Congo shows, the future of young and as yet unconsolidated States would be jeopardized, since their wealth whets the appetite of the predatory monopolies.

110. Those who bear the responsibility for the present situation in the Congo are attempting to make the Soviet Union and other States pay for the operations of the colonial Powers aimed at subverting the independence of the Congo and dismembering that country. Can it be that they want us to pay for the murder of Patrice

Lumumba and hundreds of other patriots, for the tripartite aggression against Egypt and other similar crimes? Let no one entertain the belief that the Soviet Union will give a single kopeck or a single cent to help the colonialists sanctify their criminal deeds.

111. The Congolese tragedy is not yet over. Under cover of the United Nations flag, the colonial Powers are even now, in collusion with each other, giving effect to a new plan to split that country and turn its richest areas into appendages of the imperialist monopolies. The decisions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Congolese question are thus being unceremoniously set aside. The Soviet Government considers that the United Nations would not be performing its clear duty if it left the Congolese people at the mercy of the colonial Powers.

112. By their struggle, the peoples have broken many links in the chain of colonial domination, but they have not yet broken the entire chain. It is the vital duty of the United Nations to tear off and destroy the colonial shackles completely.

113. Whenever the most urgent tasks of consolidating peace are at issue, our thoughts inevitably turn to the problem of concluding a German peace treaty and normalizing, on that basis, the situation in West Berlin. This problem, in its acuteness, can even rival the problem of disarmament. The United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and certain other NATO countries are in effect turning the question of a German peace treaty into a test of strength between East and West. This leads to acute and very dangerous tension in relations between States and particularly between the great Powers.

114. The seventeen years which have elapsed since the defeat of Hitler's Germany have not planed down the sharp edges of the German problem: on the contrary, they have made them even sharper. The writing of *finis* to the Second World War by means of the conclusion of a German peace treaty is not merely what is required by international standards and practice, but, as post-war experience has shown, is essential to the establishment of lasting peace in Europe. One has only to look objectively at the present position in the Federal Republic of Germany and in West Berlin in order to be convinced of this fact.

115. If we compare the situation existing in the Federal Republic of Germany today with that in the Germany of the thirties, we can see that there is hardly any significant difference. It is true that the flags no longer bear the spidery swastika emblem. The former portraits have been replaced by others. But this is merely an outward change. There is a striking similarity in substance between the policy of Germany today and that which it was pursuing on the eve of the Second World War.

116. Before he shattered the Treaty of Versailles which had imposed certain military restrictions on Germany, Hitler prepared, within the framework of a 100,000-man-strong Reichswehr, the cadres of his future armies of millions. Today, hundreds of thousands of recruits are being moved through the barracks of the Bundeswehr by means of the same production-line technique. Their military training is based on the experience gained from Hitler's predatory campaigns. There are at present in the Federal Republic of Germany more soliders who have donned uniform than in the vast majority of the States, represented in the

United Nations, which took part in the war against German fascism.

117. On the eve of its downfall, Nazi Germany was feverishly trying to master the secret of the atomic bomb, counting on its help to change the course of the Second World War. What Hitler was not able to achieve his successors in West Germany now wish to accomplish. They are making approaches from various directions to nuclear arsenals, trying to acquire these weapons, if not directly, then under the cover of NATO. In this connexion the Federal Republic of Germany states that it is only seeking to attain "equality of armaments" with other Powers—nothing more. Nazi Germany also started by demanding equality in armaments. We all remember how that ended. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany obviously does not want to leave the trail blazed by Hitler.

118. Nothing is changed by the fact that the statesmen of certain countries which are neighbours of West Germany today close their eyes to the dangers of West German revenge-seeking and are even participating, side by side with it, in militaristic and revenge-seeking manifestations along the banks of the Rhine. It would be better, however, for those statesmen to open their eyes, not after the metal and fire of war have crashed down on the heads of their peoples, but while it is still possible for all this to be averted.

119. The leaders of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany go so far as to declare that the Second World War is not over, that it is continuing. This is what post-war European frontiers unconsolidated by a peace treaty signify! This is what the absence of a German peace treaty leads to! If an impartial court were requested to give its view on the policy of the present Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the mere statements of Bonn Ministers would suffice to produce the finding that that Government is in fact guilty of preparing revenge.

120. In stating all this, the Soviet Government is itself prompted not by any feeling of revenge, which is alien to the Soviet people, and certainly not by any fear of West Germany, but rather by a desire to prevent a recurrence of tragic events. The Soviet Union is ready to extend the hand of friendship to the Federal Republic of Germany as well. However, if genuine good-neighbour relations are to be established, there must be reciprocal action on the part of the Federal Republic of Germany. West Germany's policy-makers must come to understand that such relations correspond to the vital interests of the Federal Republic's population itself.

121. With every passing month, tension is mounting in West Berlin, which has been turned into a NATO military base directed against the USSR, the German Democratic Republic and the other socialist countries. Few days pass without attempts to use West Berlin for provocations against the German Democratic Republic, and that fact alone represents a threat to peace.

122. Certain Western statesmen assert that West Berlin is not a NATO base at all. The troops belong to NATO, but no one knows to whom the base belongs. Is this not Pharisaism?

123. No, West Berlin is a military base belonging to NATO and to no-one else. The troops of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc are stationed there, and the base serves the purposes of that bloc. If any further

confirmation were needed, it would be enough to take the statement made by Mr. Stikker, Secretary-General of NATO, at a Press conference held at Oslo on 10 September, in which in substance, he admits that the Western Powers have turned West Berlin into a NATO base. Stikker's statement concerning the determination of that military bloc to defend the rights of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France in West Berlin and to defend freedom of access to West Berlin, and other arguments of the kind, afford yet further evidence that a NATO base has been established in West Berlin under cover of the occupation régime. The Western Powers are trying to justify the presence of their troops, or, rather NATO troops, in West Berlin on the basis of old, outdated agreements going back to the wartime period. But the question of issue today is that of a German peace treaty, of restoring the situation in West Berlin to normal on the basis of such a treaty, and thus putting an end to the occupation of West Berlin and its use as a base of the aforementioned military bloc.

124. It is inadmissible that West Berlin should become a military base of the NATO bloc for use against the socialist countries. As long as the occupation régime is maintained in West Berlin, as long as the situation in that city is not restored to normal, there is and can be no guarantee that in the confined space of West Berlin, where the troops of the two most powerful groupings stand only a few metres apart, someone may not commit, at any moment, an act of provocation which will shake our planet to its foundations.

125. The USSR Government's position is that a German peace settlement can be reached without prejudice to the interests or prestige of any country or group of countries. Of course, the best solution of all would be for the Western Powers to sign, with us and with other countries, one or two separate peace treaties with the two German States. But if the Western Powers will not agree to the joint signature of a German peace treaty or two peace treaties, the Soviet Government will also entertain the following possibility: the Soviet Union and such other countries as wish to do so will sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, the idea being that at the same time the parties shall reach agreement among themselves on certain problems, well known to the Governments concerned, which call for solution in a German peace settlement. The Soviet Government has referred to these on a number of occasions.

126. The Soviet Union contends that the population of West Berlin should be free to choose their way of life, and that West Berlin should be able to maintain, without let or hindrance, political and other non-military ties with any country on any continent. The German Democratic Republic is prepared to guarantee to West Berlin the free movement of goods and passengers through its territory in accordance with the generally accepted rules of international law. The Soviet Government proposes that West Berlin, as a free city, should be given firm international guarantees to ensure its independence and security.

127. Although we are convinced that there is no need whatsoever for any foreign troops to remain in West Berlin any longer in order to guarantee its independence, the Soviet Government has given its consent to the temporary stationing of token military units in that city. Our proposals on the subject are known and there is no need to repeat them. One variant of our

proposal is that token contingents of United Nations troops should be stationed in West Berlin. What is wrong with a proposal that the United Nations should show itself and demonstrate its will to peace in such an important area as the centre of Europe? When United Nations guarantees are rejected and the presence of NATO troops is categorically insisted upon, it becomes even clearer that considerations of ensuring the independence of West Berlin and the freedom of its population do not really count with the Western Powers.

128. Recent experience has shown that, when there is a desire to solve complex international problems, even very acute ones, on a basis of co-operation and consideration for each other's interests, such co-operation gets results. An example of this was the successful settlement of the Laotian question. Another no less cogent example was the attainment of agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands on the reunion of West Irian with Indonesia. In that connexion, we offer our warm congratulations to the Indonesian people and Government. As Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, the Head of the Soviet Government, has pointed out, both these examples show that complex international problems can and must be solved, not by threats, but by negotiation, by peaceful settlement. This, the only correct method, is consistently advocated by the Soviet Union.

129. But the Western Powers would be making a serious miscalculation if they were to take the Soviet Union's desire to achieve settlement in agreement with them for willingness to accept endless delays in the conclusion of a German peace treaty. If the Western Powers leave us no choice, the Soviet Union, together with such other States as wish to do so, will sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, with all the consequences that entails. In taking that step the Soviet Union will, strictly speaking, only be doing what the United States of America and the other Western Powers did ten years ago in signing, without the USSR, a peace treaty with Japan.

130. Sometimes the NATO countries try resorting to open or disguised threats, to the point of declaring that in response to the conclusion of a peace treaty the Western Powers would even use force. But those who make such statements may be asked this question: are they weighing their words with sufficient care? The Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and the other States which are prepared to sign a German peace treaty will not allow the legitimate rights of the German Democratic Republic to be violated and will not let West Berlin remain a centre of provocation against the socialist States and a NATO base. They will not agree that the occupation régime and the forces of occupation should stay in West Berlin in perpetuity.

131. The conclusion of a German peace treaty will remove the last vestiges of occupation from the territory of the German Democratic Republic, and the parties to the treaty will regard West Berlin as a free, demilitarized city. After such a treaty is signed, control over communications with West Berlin will vest in the German Democratic Republic and no-one else. Its sovereignty will be securely guarded, and the frontiers of the German Democratic Republic will remain under staunch protection.

132. Let no one read into our words a lack of desire to find an agreed solution to the German problem. The Soviet Government and Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, the Head of that Government, personally have stated

more than once that we still prefer such a solution to this whole problem. We shall be compelled to take the action of which I spoke only if no agreed solution can be found.

133. It is impossible to ignore the situation, fraught with great danger, which still prevails in the Far East. The island of Taiwan, Chinese territory since time immemorial, has still not been reunited with China, and is still occupied by the United States of America, and has been turned into a military springboard for the United States against the people's China and other socialist States. The longer the United States pursues this aggressive policy towards China, the longer United States occupation of the island of Taiwan continues, the greater will grow the danger to peace in the Far East and throughout the world. The legitimate interest of the people's China and the interests of the maintenance of peace demand that the foreign occupation of Taiwan be brought to an end.

134. The conversion of South Korea into a United States military base and the presence of foreign troops there merely add fuel to the inflammable situation in the Far Eastern region. As you know, the Soviet Government has raised the question of the need to withdraw foreign troops from South Korea and has proposed to the General Assembly that it should consider this question at the present session. A positive solution of this problem would do much to restore the situation to normal in the Far East.

135. Permit me to state the Soviet Government's views on yet another of the most acute factors in the contemporary international situation.

136. I refer to the calls to unleash a preventive nuclear war, to strike the first nuclear blow, which leading statesmen of certain NATO Powers have begun to utter. It is not long since a statement by the President of the United States flashed round the world to the effect that, in certain circumstances, the United States might take the initiative in a nuclear conflict.

137. The Soviet Government would prefer to speak from this rostrum, not of the things which estrange the USSR and the United States and which drive them poles apart, but of that friendship, trust and agreement between them which, we are convinced, would be greeted with deep satisfaction by all those who care about peace. The Soviet Government has stated on more than one occasion that it is in favour of such friendship, and that good relations between the two Powers—the USSR and the United States—would lead to a radical change for the better in the international situation as a whole.

138. If we censure statements about the possibility of resorting to preventive nuclear war, we do not do so in order to criticize particular individuals or statesmen. No; we protest against this doctrine itself in order to eliminate the dangers it holds for all peoples and, not least, in order to clear the way for co-operation and mutual understanding between the USSR and the United States.

139. Think what is implied in statements about preventive nuclear war. To "take the initiative" in such a war means being the first to rain down atomic and hydrogen bombs on a peaceful country. Any objectively-minded person will say that such an "initiative" is nothing else but aggression. When statements of this kind are spread abroad, not a single person in either the eastern or the western hemisphere can be free

...the oppressive sense that the world can be plunged into a military catastrophe at any moment.

140. Threats of preventive nuclear war are so monstrous that it is difficult even to believe they are being made in the mid-twentieth century, while mankind pays homage to the heroes who are blazing the trail to the stars, and marvels at the invention of highly complex electronic machinery and the many other outstanding achievements of world civilization.

141. In an attempt to present the "shoot first" position in a nuclear war in a more palatable form, its originators assert that the United States will strike the first nuclear blow at the USSR, and thus unleash thermo-nuclear war, in the event of a mass attack by the Soviet Union on Europe with conventional weapons. Statements of this kind have only one purpose: to mislead the credulous.

142. Quite apart from the fact that arguments about any attack by the Soviet Union—mass or not—are in themselves completely without foundation, it is perfectly clear that the purpose of these arguments is to prepare, in anticipation, justifications and loopholes for aggression. When a State intends to provoke a military clash, it will find a way to do so. It will find it no more difficult to represent such a clash, provoked by itself, as a mass attack by the other: that is to say, as precisely what has been declared in advance to be grounds for striking a nuclear blow.

143. The scheme is a somewhat primitive one and in fact differs little from, for example, those used to start the First and, especially, the Second World War. The assumption, manufactured from beginning to end, of a threat of some kind of Soviet attack on Europe is invented only as an outer cloak for the aggressive policy line of the NATO military bloc.

144. The idea of "the first blow", the idea of preventive war, is far from new. In the lifetime of our generation it has already left its bloody trail in dozens of countries in Europe, and not in Europe alone—a trail trodden in by the jackboots of the fascist invaders and ground in by the tracks of their tanks.

145. The Soviet people have not forgotten that Hitlerite Germany's bandit attack on the Soviet Union in June 1941 was also dressed up in statements about a "Soviet threat", although the whole world knew that Hitler and the members of his criminal gang were lying. We must assume, too, that the American people remember Pearl Harbor. Yet what Japan did to the United States of America is what the partisans of the doctrine of preventive war are calling for now.

146. What is happening? The whole world now angrily condemns—and, it is evident, more than one generation will condemn in the future—the policy of fascist Germany and militarist Japan, which plunged mankind into the Second World War. They will condemn the perfidy and cunning of the then arbiters of those countries' destinies, who by lying references to a danger allegedly threatening Germany and Japan sought to justify aggression and their own bloody adventures.

147. What then? Is the doctrine of preventive war now to be used as a weapon by the very people who were themselves among its victims, and who—together with us, their allies in the Second World War—passed sentence on the Nazi criminals? Surely when we, together with the United States and the other allied Powers, tried the chief war criminals, their barbarous policy, which led to the unleashing of the Second World War,

was with them in the dock. How can anyone forget all this today and declare with a clear conscience that he is ready to take the initiative in a nuclear conflict?

148. Perhaps not all of those present in this hall fully realize the danger of statements about the possibility of resorting to preventive nuclear war. But put yourselves in the position of the people and Government of a country at which such statements have been aimed, and you will undoubtedly understand what feelings they can arouse and to what conclusions they must lead. How, in fact, are they to be interpreted: merely as a routine threat, or as something more? Is it enough to be on the alert, or must measures be taken to anticipate an aggressor? That is the kind of question prompted by calls for preventive war.

149. We know that the United Nations has not always, in all cases, responded to acute international problems. But there are problems and problems. When it is a matter of averting a catastrophe, no one can remain indifferent. There is not, and cannot be, a position midway between condemning and not condemning preventive nuclear war, as there can be no position midway between life and death.

150. The Soviet Union attaches grave significance to this problem not only—not even particularly—because the threats are aimed primarily in its direction. The Soviet Union has everything it needs with which to meet any aggressor fully armed and to destroy it. The peoples of our country have more than once proved on the battlefield their readiness to stand up for themselves, for freedom and for the independence of their homeland. At the present time our country is marking the 150th anniversary of the rout of the army, till then apparently invincible, with which Napoleon invaded Russia. On 9 May every year we celebrate the Day of Victory over Hitlerite Germany, whose hordes were also thought by many to be invincible until they were smashed and routed in battles with the Soviet army. Today our country, together with its friends the socialist countries, is stronger than ever before. Therefore the Soviet people and the socialist countries cannot be scared by threats of preventive war. But the Soviet Government, following its unswerving and consistent policy of peace, is doing all that lies in its power to prevent a new world war.

151. Any call to strike the first nuclear blow runs counter to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and to the interests of maintaining peace, and is incompatible with the honour and conscience of mankind. The Soviet Government therefore considers it necessary to submit to the United Nations General Assembly, for consideration as a special agenda item at its seventeenth session, the important and urgent question of "Condemnation of propaganda favouring preventive nuclear war" and the draft of an appropriate General Assembly resolution (A/5232).

152. We call on all States possessing nuclear weapons, as a first step on the way to a complete ban on their use, to give without delay a solemn undertaking not to be the first to use these weapons.

153. The Soviet Government has for many years persistently striven, within the United Nations and at other international conferences and negotiations, and particularly at the Summit Conference held at Geneva in 1955,^{4/} to induce the Powers concerned to give such

^{4/} The Conference of Heads of Government of the four great Powers was held from 18 to 23 July 1955.

an undertaking. It is ready to put its signature to an agreement on those lines this very day.

154. Is it not a warning in itself that the Government of the United States of America should be unwilling to undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons? One who does not intend to fire the first shot in a nuclear war has no reason for refusing to give an appropriate international undertaking to that effect. Who can possibly suffer by such a decision? No one, so long as he has no aggressive intentions.

155. Permit me to express the hope that the General Assembly will give the proposal for the condemnation of propaganda favouring preventive nuclear war the careful consideration which befits the seriousness of the question raised by the Soviet Government and its importance to the cause of safeguarding universal peace, and will take the appropriate decision.

156. Sessions of the General Assembly are distinct milestones in international life; some sessions leave no perceptible mark on the peoples' consciousness, but others are marked by the adoption of decisions which bring nearer the realization of the purposes and principles proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations.

157. If the United Nations is to become a genuine centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievement of international co-operation, as its Charter requires, it must accurately and fully reflect the contemporary world scene. Unfortunately it is still a long way from doing so.

158. Contrary to its Charter, and to the detriment of the cause of international co-operation, the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China continue to be usurped. This is happening for one single reason: because of the policy pursued towards China by the United States of America, which from year to year, from one session of the General Assembly to another, keeps, or more precisely maintains, the Chiang Kai-shekist mummy in the place in the United Nations that belongs to the people's China and to it alone.

159. The two German States and some other States remain outside the United Nations, and this also undermines its importance as a weapon in the struggle for peace.

160. The United Nations would undoubtedly be better equipped to meet the tasks before it if its structure was altered to fit the situation now obtaining in the world, and if the three existing main groups of States—the socialist countries, the countries belonging to Western blocs, and the neutralist countries—were represented on an equal footing in its governing organs. The Soviet Government's proposals on this subject are well known, and we shall press these just demands with all the insistence at our command. So long as the situation in the United Nations remains abnormal and fails to present a true reflection of the world scene, the Organization will be unable to deal successfully with the tasks assigned to it.

161. The Soviet delegation has frankly stated the Soviet Government's position on the most acute and pressing problems of international life. We have done this in order to draw the attention of the United Nations to these problems, in the hope that all States represented in this international forum will become yet more conscious of the responsibility they bear for preserving peace. The peoples' will for peace should serve all States as a guiding principle in all their

actions. The Soviet Union, for its part, will as heretofore steadfastly pursue a policy of peace and friendship between peoples, a policy of peaceful coexistence between States irrespective of their social structure; for this is precisely the policy which corresponds to the most cherished interests and aspirations of all peoples.

162. The PRESIDENT: I now call upon the representative of the United States, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

163. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): I had hoped that it would not be necessary to interrupt the general debate, but the utterances of the representative of communist Cuba yesterday and of Mr. Gromyko today leave me no choice but also to exercise my right of reply, not on all that has been said here, which unhappily follows the pattern of the persistent prosecution of the cold war, but with respect to what has been said about Cuba.

164. The sober seventeenth session has ended on the fourth day, and I would remind the Members of the United Nations that since the attack on Cuba by refugees from Cuba in April 1961, repeated complaints have been brought to the United Nations by Cuba, accompanied by hysterical charges that the United States was plotting, planning and preparing immediate invasion.

165. One of these complaints, as I recall, was filed in August 1961 but was not pressed until six months later. The attack was called "imminent" in August but evidently even the Cubans did not believe it. And as you know, all these complaints were dismissed one by one by overwhelming votes, but only after the expenditure of much time by the representative and expense to the Organization. From what has been said here it is apparent that we are going to suffer another sustained assault on our patience and on our credulity. I would have thought that there was plenty of useful work to do here without renewing these tired charges.

166. Mr. Gromyko says that the United States has asserted the right to attack Cuba because it has another system. He says no nation should interfere in the affairs of another. I marvel. I marvel at the bland hypocrisy of the nation that subverted the wholesome Cuban social revolution to communism, that crushed with tanks the independence of Hungary, that holds in thrall all of Eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Black Sea. Yet he presumes to lecture us on interference in the affairs of others. But as we know only too well, such righteous rhetoric is the standing communist cloak for the very interference it charges to others.

167. Now in direct answer, let me say to the representatives of the Soviet Union and Cuba that we are not taking and will not take offensive action in this hemisphere, neither will we permit aggression in this hemisphere. For, as the President of the United States made clear on 13 September 1962, we and other countries of the Americas will not be deterred from taking whatever action is needed by threats from any quarter. While we will not commit aggression we will take whatever steps are necessary to prevent the Government of Cuba from seeking to subvert any part of this hemisphere. We shall work closely with our inter-American partners, and this intention does not of course derogate from our right, a right enshrined in the United Nations Charter, to protect our vital national security.